arXiv:cond-mat/0010479v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 30 Oct 2000

Finite-Size Correlation Length and Violations of Finite-Size Scaling

Sergio Caracciolo and Andrea Gambassi

Scuola Normale Superiore and INFN – Sezione di Pisa
I-56100 Pisa, ITALIA
Internet: sergio.caracciolo@sns.it, andrea.gambassi@sns.it

Massimiliano Gubinelli

Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Pisa
Università degli Studi di Pisa
I-56100 Pisa, ITALIA
Internet: mgubi@cibs.sns.it

Andrea Pelissetto

Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN – Sezione di Roma I
Università degli Studi di Roma "La Sapienza"
I-00185 Roma, ITALIA
Internet: Andrea.Pelissetto@roma1.infn.it

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We address the problem of the definition of the finite-volume correlation length. First, we study the large-N limit of the N-vector model, and we show the existence of several constraints on the definition if regularity of the finite-size scaling functions and correct anomalous behaviour above the upper critical dimension are required. Then, we study in detail a model in which the zero mode in prohibited. Such a model is a generalization of the fixed-magnetization Ising model which is equivalent to the lattice gas. Also in this case, we find that the finite-volume correlation length must satisfy appropriate constraints in order to obtain regular finite-size scaling functions, and, above the upper critical dimension, an anomalous scaling behaviour. The large-N results are confirmed by a one-loop calculation in the lattice ϕ^4 theory.

1 Introduction

Phase transitions are characterized by a nonanalytic behaviour at the critical point. These non-analyticities are however observed only in the infinite-volume limit. If the system is finite, all thermodynamic functions are analytic in the thermodynamic parameters, temperature, applied magnetic field, and so on. However, even from a finite sample, it is possible to obtain many informations on the critical behaviour. Indeed, large but finite systems show a universal behaviour called finite-size scaling (FSS). The FSS hypothesis, formulated for the first time by Fisher [1–3] and justified theoretically by using renormalized continuum field theory [4, 5] (a collection of relevant articles on the subject appears in [6]), is a very powerful method to extrapolate to the thermodynamic limit the results obtained from a finite sample, both in experiments and in numerical simulations. In particular, the most recent Monte Carlo studies rely heavily on FSS for the determination of critical properties (see, e.g., [7–16] for recent applications in two and three dimensions; the list is of course far from being exhaustive).

The most commonly studied systems are those that show a second-order phase transition at a critical temperature T_c. In this case there are quantities $\mathcal{O}$ which in infinite volume behave as

$$\mathcal{O}_\infty(t) \equiv \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_\infty \sim |t|^{-x_\mathcal{O}} \qquad \text{for} \quad t \to 0 \tag{1.1}$$

where $t \equiv (T - T_c)/T_c$ is the reduced temperature and $\langle \cdot \rangle_\infty$ denote averaging in the infinite-volume system. In a finite sample of length L in all directions, the finite-volume mean values $\mathcal{O}_L(t) \equiv \langle \mathcal{O} \rangle_L$ are analytic functions of t. However, for large L, the FSS theory predicts a scaling behaviour of the form

$$\mathcal{O}_L(t) = G_\mathcal{O}(t, L) \approx L^{x_\mathcal{O}/\nu} \, g_\mathcal{O}\left(tL^{1/\nu}\right). \tag{1.2}$$

where $\nu \equiv x_\xi$ is the critical exponent which, according to (1.2), controls the divergence of the bulk correlation length ξ. The function $g_\mathcal{O}(z)$ is finite and non-vanishing in zero, and should satisfy

$$g_\mathcal{O}(z) \sim |z|^{-x_\mathcal{O}} \qquad \text{for} \quad z \to \infty \tag{1.3}$$

in order to recover the singular behaviour (1.1) in the limit $L \to \infty$ followed by $t \to 0$.

Equation (1.2) can be conveniently rewritten in terms of the bulk correlation length, which avoids the knowledge of the critical temperature:

$$\mathcal{O}_L(t) \approx L^{x_\mathcal{O}/\nu} \, f_\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\xi_\infty(t)}{L}\right), \tag{1.4}$$

where $f_\mathcal{O}(z)$ is finite for $z \to \infty$ and

$$f_\mathcal{O}(z) \sim |z|^{x_\mathcal{O}/\nu} \qquad \text{for} \quad z \to 0. \tag{1.5}$$

Eq. (1.4) shows that, even if two lengths, the size of the sample and the correlation length, characterize the finite-sample behaviour of the observable $\mathcal{O}$, in the FSS regime only their ratio is relevant.

Eqs. (1.2) and (1.4) apply only below the upper critical dimension $d_>$. Indeed, Fisher [17–19] showed that for $d \geq d_>$ there are violations to FSS. In the context of the renormalization group these violations can be understood as due to the presence of dangerously irrelevant operators.

The failure of standard FSS can also be understood phenomenologically. For instance, let us consider the order parameter M for an Ising model in a finite system of size L with periodic boundary conditions. According to the previous discussion, we expect that

$$\langle |M| \rangle_L \sim L^{-\beta/\nu} \, g_M \left(t L^{1/\nu} \right) , \tag{1.6}$$

while the ordering susceptibility

$$\chi_L = \frac{1}{T} \, L^d \, \langle M; M \rangle_L \tag{1.7}$$

behaves as

$$\chi_L \sim L^{\gamma/\nu} \, g_\chi \left(t L^{1/\nu} \right) . \tag{1.8}$$

Note that, since $\langle M \rangle_L = 0$, we have $\langle M^2 \rangle_L = T L^{-d} \chi_L$. Moreover, in the low-temperature phase, for $t \to 0^-$ at fixed large L, $\langle |M| \rangle_L^2 \sim \langle M^2 \rangle_L$. Then, if $g_M(0)$ and $g_\chi(0)$ are finite, relations (1.6) and (1.8) are compatible only if the hyperscaling relation [20]

$$d \, \nu = \gamma + 2 \, \beta \tag{1.9}$$

holds. But for $d \geq d_> = 4$, hyperscaling is violated, since the system shows mean-field behaviour. The anomalous scaling behaviour can be obtained by adding power-law violations. Following [21, 22] we write

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_L &= L^{2+y_2} \tilde{g}_\chi \left(t \, L^{2+y_1} \right) , & (1.10) \\ \langle |M| \rangle_L &= L^{-1+y_3} \tilde{g}_M \left(t \, L^{2+y_1} \right) , & (1.11) \\ \xi_L &= L^{1+y_4} \tilde{g}_\xi \left(t \, L^{2+y_1} \right) . & (1.12) \end{aligned}$$

Requiring mean-field behaviour for $L \to \infty$, i.e. $\chi_\infty \sim |t|^{-1}$, $\langle |M| \rangle_\infty \sim (-t)^{1/2}$ for $t < 0$, and $\xi_\infty \sim |t|^{-1/2}$ we obtain $y_2 = y_1$, $y_3 = -y_1/2$, and $y_4 = y_1/2$. Using as before $\chi_L = T^{-1} L^d \langle M^2 \rangle_L \sim L^d \langle |M| \rangle_L^2$ for $t \to 0^-$, we obtain a relation which replaces the hyperscaling one (1.9):

$$-2 - y_1 = 2 + y_1 - d, \tag{1.13}$$

that is

$$y_1 = \frac{d-4}{2}. \tag{1.14}$$

For the correlation length, this implies

$$\xi_L \sim L^{d/4} \, \tilde{g}_\xi (t L^{d/2}) . \tag{1.15}$$

Note that the scaling functions now depend on the combination $t L^{d/2}$, which can be interpreted [21] as the appearance of a new *thermodynamical* scale that behaves as $t^{-\tilde{\nu}}$, $\tilde{\nu} = 2/d$.

Anomalous scaling can also be understood in the framework of renormalized continuum field theory. In general, in a finite volume, the allowed momenta are quantized—for instance $\mathbf{p} \in (2\pi \mathbb{Z}/L)^d$ on a hypercubic lattice—and therefore, all nonzero momenta have an effective mass of order L^{-1} even at the critical point. Therefore, they can be treated perturbatively. The zero mode must instead be considered exactly [5, 23]. For $d > d_>$, anomalous FSS can be obtained by taking into account only the zero mode and completely neglecting the modes with

$\mathbf{p} \neq 0$. However, this cannot always be done. Indeed, if an observable is not a zero-momentum quantity, nonzero modes must be properly treated. This can be the case of the correlation length.

A question we will ask is whether the finite-volume correlation length scales anomalously according to (1.15) as predicted by both field-theoretical approach and phenomenological arguments. Indeed the anomalous scaling depends crucially on the finite-volume definition one is choosing. For generic choices of the correlation length, one does not observe a scaling like (1.15): specific properties must be satisfied in order to observe anomalous scaling.

The question of the FSS behaviour of quantities defined for nonzero values of the momenta becomes even more important when one considers systems in which the zero mode is not allowed because of conservation laws. We are thinking here of the Ising model at fixed zero magnetization or of its equivalent counterpart, the lattice gas with fixed number of particles at half filling. The field theory of this model was studied by Eisenriegler and Tomaschiz [24] for $d < 4$. They show that one can perform an ϵ-expansion with $\epsilon = 4 - d$ and that the FSS functions of these models are different from those of the models in which the zero mode is present. Again we ask whether these field-theoretical results apply to all possible definitions of finite-volume correlation length. As in the previous case, we find that specific properties must be satisfied in order to have regular FSS functions and to observe anomalous scaling behaviour above the upper critical dimension. Note that the conditions necessary in this class of models without zero mode are different from those in the models without conservation laws. In particular "good" definitions in the unconstrained model are "bad" definitions in the model at fixed magnetization.

Our conclusions are supported by a large-N calculation in the N-vector model and by an explicit one-loop computation in the lattice ϕ^4 model.

2 N-vector model in the large-N limit

In order to have a complete control of the critical behaviour in the non-perturbative regime, we shall consider the large N-limit of the N-vector σ-model, already studied by Brézin [4] (for a detailed analysis at the lower critical dimension $d = d_< = 2$, see [25]).

We consider a d-dimensional hypercubic lattice of finite extent L in all directions, unit N-vector spins $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ defined at the sites of the lattice interacting with Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv -N \sum_{x,y} J(x-y) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_y - Nh \sum_x \sigma_x^1, \tag{2.1}$$

where $J(x)$ is a short-range coupling. The partition function is simply

$$Z \equiv \int \prod_x [d\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \, \delta(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x^2 - 1)] \, e^{-\mathcal{H}/T}. \tag{2.2}$$

In the large-N limit, assuming periodic boundary conditions and $h = 0$, the theory is solved in terms of the gap equations

$$\lambda_L \sigma_L = 0, \qquad \frac{1}{T} = \frac{\sigma_L^2}{T} + \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^*} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L}, \tag{2.3}$$

where σ_L and λ_L are the constant values, respectively, of the field $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$, and of the Lagrange multiplier which implements the constraint on the length of the spin, at the saddle-point. Moreover, $\hat{q}^2 = -2(\widehat{J}(q) - \widehat{J}(0))$, $\widehat{J}(q)$ is the Fourier transform of $J(x)$, and Λ_L^* is the lattice

$$\Lambda_L^* \equiv \left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\,\mathbb{Z}_L\right)^d. \tag{2.4}$$

In infinite volume, the same equations hold, with the simple substitution of the summation with the normalized integral over the first Brillouin zone $[-\pi, \pi]^d$.

The meaning of the parameters λ_L and σ_L is clarified by considering the magnetization and the two-point function. We define

$$M_L \equiv \langle \sigma_0^1 \rangle_L, \qquad\qquad G_L(x) \equiv \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_x \rangle_L. \tag{2.5}$$

Then

$$M_L = \sigma_L, \qquad\qquad \widehat{G}_L(q) = \frac{T}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\widehat{G}_L(q)$ is the Fourier transform of $G_L(x)$. Note that the susceptibility is given by

$$\chi_L = \frac{1}{T}\widehat{G}_L(0) = \frac{1}{\lambda_L}. \tag{2.7}$$

We wish now to define the correlation length. In infinite volume there are (at least) two possibilities:

$$\xi_\infty^{(\mathrm{exp})} \equiv -\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{|x|}{\log G_\infty(x)}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\xi_\infty^{(2)} \equiv \left(\frac{1}{2d}\frac{\sum_x G_\infty(x)|x|^2}{\sum_x G_\infty(x)}\right)^{1/2} = \left[\frac{-1}{2dT\chi_\infty}\,\frac{d^2\widehat{G}_\infty(q)}{dq_\mu dq_\mu}\bigg|_{q=0}\right]^{1/2}. \tag{2.9}$$

For $T \to T_c$ the ratio of the two definitions become one—this is a peculiarity of the large-N limit; in general their ratio is a generic constant—and thus we do not need to distinguish between them. We have

$$\xi_\infty = \frac{1}{\lambda_\infty^{1/2}}(1 + O(\lambda_\infty)). \tag{2.10}$$

This expression is exact for $\xi_\infty^{(2)}$.

In a finite box there is no *a priori* natural definition of correlation length. Clearly, the exponential correlation length cannot be generalized, so that we must devise definitions that converge to $\xi_\infty^{(2)}$ as $L \to \infty$. For instance, we can define

$$\xi_L^{(2a)} \equiv \left[\frac{\widehat{G}_L(0) - \widehat{G}_L(q_{\min})}{\hat{q}^2_{\min}\widehat{G}_L(q_{\min})}\right]^{1/2}, \tag{2.11}$$

where $q_{\min} = (2\pi/L, 0, \ldots, 0)$ (of course, by cubic symmetry, there are $2d$ equivalent definitions of $q_{\min}$), which converges to $\xi_\infty^{(2)}$ as $L \to \infty$ (this property is not specific of the large-N limit;

indeed, to prove $\xi_L \to \xi_\infty$ we need only the cubic symmetry of the model). The definition is motivated by the desire to have, also for finite L, the same relation between ξ and λ. Indeed, we have

$$\xi_L^{(2a)} = \frac{1}{\lambda_L^{1/2}}, \tag{2.12}$$

exactly. However, an equally valid definition is

$$\xi_L^{(2b)} \equiv \left[\frac{\widehat{G}_L(0) - \widehat{G}_L(q_{\min})}{\hat{q}^2_{\min} \widehat{G}_L(0)} \right]^{1/2}, \tag{2.13}$$

which gives

$$\xi_L^{(2b)} = \left(\lambda_L + \hat{q}^2_{\min}\right)^{-1/2}, \tag{2.14}$$

or

$$\xi_L^{(2c)} \equiv \left[\frac{\widehat{G}_L(0) - \widehat{G}_L(q_{\min})}{\hat{q}^2_{\min}(2\widehat{G}_L(q_{\min}) - \widehat{G}_L(0))} \right]^{1/2}, \tag{2.15}$$

which gives

$$\xi_L^{(2c)} = \left(\lambda_L - \hat{q}^2_{\min}\right)^{-1/2}. \tag{2.16}$$

For $L \to \infty$ at t fixed (i.e. λ_L fixed)

$$\xi_L^{(2a)} \approx \xi_L^{(2b)} \approx \xi_L^{(2c)} \to \xi_\infty^{(2)}, \tag{2.17}$$

so that all of them are correct. But the question is whether all of them have the correct FSS properties.

We will now show that $\xi_L^{(2c)}$ is a bad definition. In the large-N limit, this is evident. Indeed, even for finite L, $\xi_L^{(2c)}$ becomes infinite for $\lambda_L = \hat{q}^2_{\min}$. This implies that the FSS scaling function $g_\xi(z)$ defined in (1.2) diverges at a finite value of z and is not defined below it. Note that this is not a peculiarity of the large-N limit, but is completely general and it is due the fact that $\xi_L^{(2c)}$ is not defined for all temperatures at finite L. For sufficiently low values of T one always has $2\widehat{G}_L(q_{\min}) < \widehat{G}_L(0)$ (indeed, for $T = 0$ the system orders and only $\widehat{G}_L(0)$ is nonzero), so that the square root becomes ill defined. Thus, the first necessary requirement is to have a definition that is valid for all temperatures.

Now, we should discuss whether $\xi_L^{(2a)}$ and $\xi_L^{(2b)}$, which satisfy the previous requirement, can both be used as finite-size correlation lengths. Below the upper critical dimension, one can show—this is a trivial generalization of the results of [4]—that indeed both of them have correct FSS properties. However, above the upper critical dimension, i.e. for $d > 4$, this is no longer true. We will now show it explicitly in the large-N limit, by reviewing critically the results by Brézin [4].

2.1 Infinite-volume solution above the upper critical dimension

The infinite-volume solution is well known. The system has a critical point at T_c

$$\frac{1}{T_c} \equiv \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2} = \mathcal{C}_{d,0}, \tag{2.18}$$

where we define, for $d > 2n + 2$,

$$\mathcal{C}_{d,n} \equiv \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^{n+1}}. \tag{2.19}$$

Then, for $t > 0$,

$$\xi_\infty \approx \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}} \frac{1}{t}}, \qquad \chi_\infty = \frac{1}{T} \widehat{G}_\infty(0) = \xi_\infty^2 \approx \frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}} \frac{1}{t}, \tag{2.20}$$

while, for $t < 0$, the magnetization is non-vanishing and

$$M_\infty^2 = 1 - \frac{T}{T_c} = -t. \tag{2.21}$$

2.2 Finite-size scaling above the upper critical dimension

In finite volume there is no critical point and indeed $\lambda_L > 0$ for all $T > 0$ and $\lambda_L \to 0$ for $T \to 0$. We can rewrite the gap equation

$$\frac{1}{T} = \frac{1}{L^d \lambda_L} + \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L} = \frac{1}{L^d \lambda_L} + \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L} + \Psi(\lambda_L, L), \tag{2.22}$$

where the function $\Psi(\lambda_L, L)$ is defined in (A.1). Then

$$\frac{1}{T_c} - \frac{1}{T} = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \left(\frac{1}{\hat{q}^2} - \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L} \right) - \frac{1}{L^d \lambda_L} - \Psi(\lambda_L, L), \tag{2.23}$$

so that, for $\lambda_L \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, $\lambda_L L^2$ finite, we have

$$t\, \mathcal{C}_{d,0} \approx \lambda_L\, \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - L^{2-d} \left[\frac{1}{\lambda_L L^2} + \mathcal{I}(\lambda_L L^2) \right], \tag{2.24}$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is defined in (A.5). In App. A we show that $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is not singular in zero.

2.2.1 Trivial scaling of $\xi^{(2a)}$

Let us consider (2.24) and replace λ_L with $\xi_L^{(2a)}$, which we simply write as ξ_L. Then

$$t\, L^2\, \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right) \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - L^{4-d} \left[\frac{\xi_L^2}{L^2} + \mathcal{I}\left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right) \right]. \tag{2.25}$$

We wish now to consider the standard FSS, i.e. the limit $t \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, with $tL^{1/\nu} = tL^2$ fixed. For $t > 0$, (2.25) implies $\xi_L \sim L$ and

$$t\, L^2\, \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right) \mathcal{C}_{d,1} + O\left(L^{4-d} \right). \tag{2.26}$$

This can be written as

$$\xi_L = L g_\xi(tL^2), \tag{2.27}$$

where

$$g_\xi(z) = \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}}\frac{1}{z}}. \tag{2.28}$$

However, the L-dependence is only apparent, and (2.26) simply states the trivial fact $\xi_L = \xi_\infty + O(L^{4-d})$.

For $t < 0$, it is not possible that $\xi_L \sim L$. Indeed, the l.h.s. of (2.25) is negative, while the only negative term in the r.h.s. is the second one. Therefore, $\xi_L^2 \sim L^{d-2}$ —and thus $\xi_L/L \to \infty$ since $d > 4$ —and

$$t\, L^2\, \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = -\left(\frac{\xi_L^2}{L^{d-2}}\right) + O\left(L^{4-d}\right). \tag{2.29}$$

Therefore

$$\xi_L = L^{\frac{d-2}{2}}\sqrt{-tL^2\mathcal{C}_{d,0}} \tag{2.30}$$

which is the correct behaviour of the finite-size correlation length in the broken phase because of the Goldstone mode, but it is not in agreement with the usual FSS behaviour.

Similar results hold for the magnetization in the low-temperature phase, since

$$\langle |M| \rangle_L^2 \sim L^{-d}\chi_L = L^{-d}\xi_L^2 \sim L^{-2}\left(-tL^2\right) = -t = M_\infty^2, \tag{2.31}$$

which means that the FSS for this quantity is trivial.

2.2.2 Anomalous finite-size scaling of $\xi_L^{(2a)}$

In the previous Section, we have shown that it is possible to define mathematically—although it is physically irrelevant—standard FSS, even for $d > 4$. However, such a scaling is possible only for $t > 0$, and, correspondingly, the FSS functions are singular for $tL^2 \to 0$.

Now, we wish to obtain a different FSS that is defined for all values of the temperature. As we shall see, this is the standard anomalous scaling. Going back to (2.25), in order to have relations that are valid for all t, we must consider a limit in which both the first and the second term in the right-hand side of (2.25) are present. Therefore, we must require

$$tL^2 \sim L^2/\xi_L^2 \sim L^{2-d}\xi_L^2, \tag{2.32}$$

which implies $\xi_L \sim L^{d/4}$, $t \sim L^{-d/2}$. Then, we rewrite (2.25) in the limit $t \to 0$, $L, \xi_L \to \infty$ at fixed $tL^{d/2}$ and $\xi_L L^{-d/4}$. We obtain

$$tL^{d/2}\mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \frac{L^{d/2}}{\xi_L^2}\mathcal{C}_{d,1} - \frac{\xi_L^2}{L^{d/2}} + O(L^{(4-d)/2}). \tag{2.33}$$

Solving this equation we obtain

$$\xi_L = L^{d/4}\tilde{g}_\xi\left(tL^{d/2}\right), \tag{2.34}$$

where

$$\tilde{g}_\xi(z) = \left[-\frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}z}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}^2 z^2 + 4\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}\right]^{1/2}, \tag{2.35}$$

consistently with (1.15). Note that $\tilde{g}_\xi(z)$ is regular in zero, and that for $z \to +\infty$ one recovers the behaviour (2.28), and for $z \to -\infty$ the behaviour (2.30).

2.2.3 Finite-size scaling of $\xi_L^{(2b)}$

Let us now consider the second definition of correlation length. For $L \to \infty$

$$\xi_L^{(2b)} \approx \left(\lambda_L + \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-1/2}. \tag{2.36}$$

Since, for $\lambda_L \geq 0$,

$$\left(\lambda_L + \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\right)^{-1/2} \leq \frac{L}{2\pi}, \tag{2.37}$$

it is clear that $\xi_L^{(2b)}$ cannot scale anomalously, i.e. as $L^{d/4}$. We are thus forced to consider $\xi_L^{(2b)} \sim L$. However, at variance with the previous case, this condition does not fix the scaling of λ_L, and thus, we can consider both the trivial scaling and the anomalous one. Indeed, if we take $t \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, with tL^2 fixed, then $\lambda_L L^2 \to tL^2 \mathcal{C}_{d,0}/\mathcal{C}_{d,1}$ for $t > 0$ and $\lambda_L L^2 \to 0$ for $t < 0$. Then

$$\xi_L^{(2b)} = L g_\xi^{(2b)}(tL^2), \tag{2.38}$$

where

$$g_\xi^{(2b)}(z) = \begin{cases} (4\pi^2 + z\mathcal{C}_{d,0}/\mathcal{C}_{d,1})^{-1/2} & \text{for } z > 0, \\ (2\pi)^{-1} & \text{for } z < 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.39}$$

Therefore, the standard FSS limit exists, but the FSS function is not smooth at the origin. Moreover, as we observed in the case of $\xi_L^{(2a)}$, it does not give any information on the finite-size physics of the system, since it is simply obtained by replacing λ_L by λ_∞ in (2.36), and then using the expression of λ_∞ in terms of t.

If instead we keep $tL^{d/2}$ fixed, then $\lambda_L L^2 \to 0$, so that

$$\xi_L^{(2b)} = \frac{L}{2\pi}. \tag{2.40}$$

The FSS function is well defined but does not contain any dynamical information.

2.3 Summary

In this Section we discussed the FSS behaviour of the correlation length above the upper critical dimension. First, we considered the standard scaling $t \to 0$, $L \to \infty$ at fixed tL^2. The limit exists, but it is singular for $tL^2 = 0$ and trivial, since the corresponding FSS functions do not contain any dynamical information. A nontrivial result is obtained only by considering the anomalous scaling at fixed $tL^{d/2}$ for some specific definitions of finite-volume correlation length. Indeed, for *generic* definitions, for instance for $\xi_L^{(2b)}$, however the limiting behaviour of the temperature is defined—keeping tL^2 or $tL^{d/2}$ fixed—the FSS is always trivial: the FSS functions do not contain any information on the dynamics of the system. In particular, there is no way to observe the anomalous scaling $\xi_L \sim L^{d/4}$. Such a scaling can only be observed by an appropriate choice of ξ_L, and indeed, the definition $\xi_L^{(2a)}$ does show an anomalous scaling behaviour. In the large-N limit it is easy to understand why: since $(\xi_L^{(2a)})^2 = \chi_L$, $\xi_L^{(2a)}$ is effectively a zero-momentum quantity. Of course, the interesting question is whether these results apply to generic values of N. Since the theory above the critical dimension is essentially

Gaussian, we expect $\xi_L^{(2a)}$ to show anomalous scaling for all values of N, and this is confirmed by the one-loop computation that will be presented in Sec. 4. Of course, there are many other definitions that also show anomalous scaling. If one follows carefully the computations of Sec. 2.2.2, one can convince herself that the relevant property is that ξ_L behaves as $\lambda_L^{-1/2}$ for $\lambda_L \to 0$. For instance, we could have used any definition of the form $\xi_L = \lambda_L^{-1/2} h(\lambda_L L^\rho)$, with any $\rho \geq 0$, $h(\infty) = 1$, and $h(0)$ finite, again obtaining anomalous scaling. In other words, in order to have an anomalous scaling behaviour $\xi_L \sim L^{d/4}$ and nontrivial scaling functions, the finite-volume correlation length must be finite for all temperatures $T \neq 0$ and diverge properly for $T \to 0$.

3 The model at fixed zero magnetization in the large-N limit

As we mentioned in the introduction, in order to discuss the FSS of a lattice gas, one can consider the Ising model at fixed magnetization. To observe a critical behaviour one must fix the magnetization to zero. Here, we discuss the natural generalization for $N \to \infty$, considering in a finite box a model with a modified gap equation of the form

$$\frac{1}{T} = \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L}. \tag{3.1}$$

The only difference with respect to the case we have considered above is the absence of the zero mode in the summation. In infinite volume we recover the usual gap equation and therefore the same results apply. In finite volume, for $T \geq 0$ the gap equation has always a solution $\lambda_L \geq -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$. In particular $\lambda_L \to -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$ for $T \to 0$.

Since in this model the magnetization is vanishing, we cannot define quantities at zero momentum, and therefore we cannot use $\xi_L^{(2a)}$ or $\xi_L^{(2b)}$ as our definition of correlation length. However, even in this case we can define ξ_L in order to obtain $\xi_L^2 = 1/\lambda_L$. For instance, we can consider

$$\xi_L^{(2d)} \equiv \left[\frac{\widehat{G}_L(q_2) - \widehat{G}_L(q_1)}{\hat{q}_1^2 \widehat{G}_L(q_1) - \hat{q}_2^2 \widehat{G}_L(q_2)} \right]^{1/2}, \tag{3.2}$$

where q_1 and q_2 are two arbitrary non-vanishing momenta in Λ_L^*. This is the natural generalization of $\xi_L^{(2a)}$, which does not make use of the propagator at zero momentum. In the theory with zero mode, this definition is of course a good one and $\xi_L^{(2d)}$ has all the expected F'S properties. However, in the absence of the zero mode, this definition has a serious shortcoming. It is defined only for $\lambda_L > 0$, and we know that λ_L may become negative for L finite. As a consequence, even in finite volume, $\xi_L^{(2d)}$ diverges at a pseudo-critical temperature

$$\frac{1}{T_c(L)} \equiv \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2}. \tag{3.3}$$

In order to overcome these problems we wish to adopt a new definition such that ξ_L is finite for all temperatures. This means that we need a definition that applies for all $\lambda_L \geq -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$. Such

a property is enough to guarantee the regularity of the FSS functions below the upper critical dimension. However, as we discussed in the previous Section, in order to obtain anomalous scaling above the upper critical dimension, the finite-volume correlation length must diverge for $T \to 0$. Thus, we require that for $\lambda_L \to -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$

$$\xi_L \to (\lambda_L + \hat{q}^2_{\min})^{-1/2}. \tag{3.4}$$

It is easy to write down a definition that satisfies (3.4) exactly. For instance, if we define

$$\xi_L^{(2e)} \equiv \left[\frac{\widehat{G}_L(q_{\min}) - \widehat{G}_L(q_2)}{\widehat{G}_L(q_2)(\hat{q}_2^2 - \hat{q}^2_{\min})} \right]^{1/2}, \tag{3.5}$$

for any $q_2 \neq 0, q_{\min} \in \Lambda_L^*$, we have exactly

$$\xi_L^{(2e)} = (\lambda_L + \hat{q}^2_{\min})^{-1/2}. \tag{3.6}$$

We will now discuss the FSS properties of $\xi_L^{(2d)}$ and of $\xi_L^{(2e)}$.

3.1 Finite-size scaling above the upper critical dimension

Considering for simplicity only the case $4 < d < 6$, we can rewrite the gap equation as

$$\frac{1}{T} = \mathcal{C}_{d,0} - \lambda_L \mathcal{C}_{d,1} + \widehat{\Psi}(\lambda_L, L), \tag{3.7}$$

where $\widehat{\Psi}(\lambda_L, L)$ is defined in (A.13). Then, for $\lambda_L \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, $\lambda_L L^2$ finite,

$$t\, \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \lambda_L\, \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - L^{2-d} \widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\lambda_L L^2), \tag{3.8}$$

where $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)$ is defined in (A.16).

3.1.1 Finite-size scaling of $\xi_L^{(2d)}$

Using $\xi_L = \xi_L^{(2d)} = \lambda_L^{-1/2}$, we rewrite (3.8) as

$$t\, L^2 \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right) \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - L^{4-d} \widehat{\mathcal{I}} \left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right), \tag{3.9}$$

which should be compared with (2.25).

Keeping tL^2 as the scaling variable and taking the FSS limit we obtain, for $t > 0$, the same results as in Section 2.2.1, but for $t < 0$ there is no scaling form since ξ_L is not defined for $t < 0$.

We can also obtain an anomalous scaling. If $L/\xi_L \to 0$, we can rewrite (3.9) as

$$t\, L^{d-2} \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = L^{d-4}\, \frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2}\, \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - \mathcal{I}(0) + O\left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2} \right) \tag{3.10}$$

where we have used $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(0) = \mathcal{I}(0)$, see (A.18). It follows, for $t\, L^{d-2} > -\mathcal{I}(0)/\mathcal{C}_{d,0}$,

$$\xi_L = L^{\frac{d-2}{2}}\, \tilde{g}_\xi^0(t\, L^{d-2}) \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$\tilde{g}_\xi^0(z) = \left[\frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0} z + \mathcal{I}(0)}\right]^{1/2}, \tag{3.12}$$

which shows a different violation of FSS if compared with (1.15). However, there is no much physics in this "new" anomalous scaling. Indeed, if we define

$$\hat{t} = \frac{T - T_c(L)}{T} \approx t + L^{2-d}\frac{\mathcal{I}(0)}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}}, \tag{3.13}$$

where $T_c(L)$ is the pseudo-critical temperature (3.3), then (3.11) can be rewritten as

$$\xi_L = L^{\frac{d-2}{2}}\, g_\xi(\hat{t}\, L^{d-2}) = L g_\xi(\hat{t}\, L^2) \sim \hat{t}^{-1/2}, \tag{3.14}$$

where $g_\xi(z)$ is defined in (2.28). The new scaling is just a consequence of the definition of the correlation length, but gives no information on the finite-volume physics.

3.1.2 Finite-size scaling of $\xi_L^{(2e)}$

The correlation length $\xi_L^{(2e)}$ is defined for all values of λ_L, i.e. for $\lambda_L > -\hat{q}^2_{\rm min} \approx -4\pi^2/L^2$. When $\lambda_L L^2 \to -4\pi^2$, the function $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\lambda_L L^2)$ becomes singular, see (A.17). It is thus convenient to introduce a new function $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}(\lambda_L L^2)$ which is finite in the limit $\lambda_L L^2 \to -4\pi^2$ by writing

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) = \, 2\, d\, \left[\frac{1}{4\pi^2 + \rho} + \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}(4\pi^2 + \rho)\right]. \tag{3.15}$$

Then, for $4 < d < 6$, we can rewrite (3.8) as

$$t\, L^2 \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \left[\left(\frac{L}{\xi_L}\right)^2 - 4\pi^2\right] \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - 2d\, L^{4-d}\left[\left(\frac{\xi_L}{L}\right)^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}\left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2}\right)\right], \tag{3.16}$$

where, in this section, $\xi_L = \xi_L^{(2e)}$. If we introduce

$$\tilde{t} \equiv t + \frac{4\pi^2}{L^2}\,\frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}}, \tag{3.17}$$

we may write (3.16) as

$$\tilde{t}\, L^2 \mathcal{C}_{d,0} = \left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2}\right)\, \mathcal{C}_{d,1} - 2d\, L^{4-d}\left[\left(\frac{\xi_L}{L}\right)^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}\left(\frac{L^2}{\xi_L^2}\right)\right], \tag{3.18}$$

which is identical to (2.25) with the trivial substitutions $\mathcal{C}_{d,j} \to \mathcal{C}_{d,j}/2d$, $j = 0, 1$, and $\mathcal{I} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{I}}$. Thus, all considerations we made for (2.25) apply here. In particular, we can consider the FSS limit with $\xi_L L^{-d/4}$ fixed, obtaining

$$\xi_L = \, L^{d/4} \tilde{g}_\xi(\tilde{t} L^{d/2}), \tag{3.19}$$

where $\tilde{g}_\xi(z)$ is defined in (2.35). Although formally the same, (3.19) differs significantly from (2.35) because of the presence of $\tilde{t}$. This means that the anomalous scaling is not obtained by varying t as $L^{-d/2}$, but rather as

$$t = -4\pi^2 \frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}} L^{-2} + \text{const}\, L^{-d/2}. \tag{3.20}$$

The presence of the L^{-2} term represents a sort of finite-volume critical-temperature renormalization and, as we will show in the next section, is a general phenomenon and not a peculiarity of the large-N limit.

As before, we can obtain the trivial scaling from (3.19) by taking the limit $\tilde{t}L^{d/2} \to \infty$. For example, for $\tilde{t} \to +\infty$, we obtain

$$\xi_L = L g_\xi(\tilde{t}L^2) = L g_\xi\left(tL^2 + 4\pi^2 \frac{\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}}\right), \tag{3.21}$$

where $g_\xi(z)$ is defined in (2.28).

3.2 Summary

We have discussed the FSS of the correlation length in a model that generalizes for $N \to \infty$ the lattice gas. As before, we find several constraints on the finite-volume definition of correlation length. First, ξ_L must be defined for all temperatures. This condition is of course obvious. What is not obvious is that definitions that are "good" for the model with the zero mode are "bad" here. An example is $\xi_L^{(2d)}$. The reason is very general and it is due to the fact that typical configurations for $T \to 0$ are different in the two cases. For instance, consider $\xi_L^{(2d)}$ with $q_1 = q_{\min}$. Since, for $T = 0$, $\widehat{G}_L(q)$ vanishes except for $q = q_{\min}$ or for the $(2d-1)$ equivalent points, the argument of the square root in (3.2) is negative and therefore $\xi_L^{(2d)}$ is not defined for low temperatures.

A correlation length that is well defined for all temperatures shows standard FSS behaviour below the upper critical dimension. However, this is not enough to have an anomalous scaling behaviour. Indeed, consider $\xi_L^{(2e)}$ and replace $q_{\min}$ by any other non-vanishing momentum. Then, it is easy to verify that, for $\lambda_L > -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$, ξ_L is bounded by L, so that no anomalous scaling can be observed. As before the important property is that ξ_L diverges for $T \to 0$.

4 The correlation length in perturbation theory

We wish now to show briefly that the results we have obtained non-perturbatively in the large-N limit can be recovered in perturbation theory, by considering the ϕ^4 theory.

Specifically, we consider N-component vector fields on a d-dimensional hypercubic lattice and the Hamiltonian

$$H[\boldsymbol{\phi}] \equiv \sum_x \left[-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\phi}_x \cdot \partial^2 \boldsymbol{\phi}_x + \frac{1}{2} r \boldsymbol{\phi}_x \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}_x + \frac{u}{4!} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_x \cdot \boldsymbol{\phi}_x)^2 \right] \tag{4.1}$$

where ∂^2 is a lattice Laplacian, such that $\partial^2 \to -\hat{q}^2$ after a Fourier transform.

At one loop we have, for a finite lattice of size L,

$$\widehat{G}_L^{-1}(q) = \Gamma_L^{(2)}(q) = \hat{q}^2 + r + u\Sigma_L(r) + O(u^2), \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$\Sigma_L(r) \equiv \frac{N+2}{6}\frac{1}{L^d}\sum_{p\in\Lambda_L^*}\frac{1}{\hat{p}^2+r}. \tag{4.3}$$

In the fixed-magnetization ensemble, we must simply eliminate the zero mode. Thus, (4.2) remains valid with the simple substitution of $\Sigma_L(r)$ with $\Sigma'_L(r)$ in which the summation over p is restricted to $(\Lambda_L^* - \{0\})$. We will now discuss the FSS behaviour in perturbation theory of our "good" definitions of finite-volume correlation length in the two cases, above the upper critical dimension.

4.1 The model with the zero mode

Using (4.2), we have for $\xi_L^{(2a)}$:

$$\left(\xi_L^{(2a)}\right)^{-2} = r + u\Sigma_L(r) + O(u^2). \tag{4.4}$$

The critical parameter r_c is defined, in the infinite volume limit, by

$$r_c + u\Sigma_\infty(r_c) = O(u^2), \tag{4.5}$$

so that $r_c = -u\Sigma_\infty(0) + O(u^2)$. Then, (4.4) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\xi_L^{(2a)}\right)^{-2} &= r - r_c + u(\Sigma_L(r) - \Sigma_\infty(r_c)) + O(u^2) = \\ &= \delta r + u[\Sigma_L(\delta r) - \Sigma_\infty(\delta r) + \Sigma_\infty(\delta r) - \Sigma_\infty(0)] + O(u^2),\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where we define $\delta r \equiv r - r_c$.

Then, for $\delta r \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, with $\delta r L^2$ finite, using the results of the Appendix we have

$$\Sigma_L(\delta r) - \Sigma_\infty(\delta r) = \frac{N+2}{6}\left[\frac{1}{\delta r L^d} + L^{2-d}\mathcal{I}(\delta r L^2)\right], \tag{4.7}$$

$$\Sigma_\infty(\delta r) - \Sigma_\infty(0) = \frac{N+2}{6}(-\delta r)\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}. \tag{4.8}$$

It follows

$$\left(\xi_L^{(2a)}\right)^{-2} = \delta r\left[1 - \frac{N+2}{6}u\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}\right] + \frac{N+2}{6}u\,\left[\frac{1}{\delta r L^d} + L^{2-d}\mathcal{I}(\delta r L^2)\right] + O(u^2), \tag{4.9}$$

i.e.

$$\xi_L^{(2a)} = L^{d/4}\,\tilde{g}_\xi^\phi(\delta r L^{d/2}), \tag{4.10}$$

where

$$\left[\tilde{g}_\xi^\phi(z)\right]^{-2} = z\left[1 - \frac{N+2}{6}u\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}\right] + \frac{N+2}{6}u\,\frac{1}{z} + O(u^2). \tag{4.11}$$

Thus, we reobtain here, within lattice perturbation theory, the non-perturbative results discussed before. In the large-N limit $N \to \infty$, $u \to 0$, with Nu fixed, $\tilde{g}^{\phi}_{\xi}(z)$ is related to $\tilde{g}_{\xi}(z)$ defined in (2.35). Indeed, it is easy to show that

$$\tilde{g}^{\phi}_{\xi}(z) = \; A(u)\; \tilde{g}_{\xi}(B(u)z), \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$A(u) = \left(\frac{6}{Nu\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}\right)^{1/4} + O(u^{3/4}), \qquad\qquad B(u) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{C}_{d,0}}\sqrt{\frac{6\mathcal{C}_{d,1}}{Nu}} + O(u^{1/2}). \tag{4.13}$$

4.2 The model without zero mode

In this case we obtain for $\xi_L^{(2e)}$:

$$\left(\xi_L^{(2e)}\right)^{-2} = r + \hat{q}^2_{min} + u\Sigma'_L(r) + O(u^2). \tag{4.14}$$

Proceeding as before, we obtain for $\delta r \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, $\delta r L^2$ finite

$$\left(\xi_L^{(2e)}\right)^{-2} = \hat{q}^2_{min} + \delta r\left[1 - \frac{N+2}{6} u\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}\right] + \frac{N+2}{6} u\; L^{2-d}\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta r L^2) + O(u^2). \tag{4.15}$$

Introducing

$$\delta\tilde{r} = \delta r + \hat{q}^2_{min}\left[1 + \frac{N+2}{6} u\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}\right], \tag{4.16}$$

and expressing $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)$ in terms of $\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)$, see (3.15), we rewrite (4.15) as

$$\left(\xi_L^{(2e)}\right)^{-2} = \delta\tilde{r}\left[1 - \frac{N+2}{6} u\,\mathcal{C}_{d,1}\right] + \frac{N+2}{6} u\; 2d\;\left[\frac{1}{\delta\tilde{r}L^d} + L^{2-d}\widetilde{\mathcal{I}}(\delta\tilde{r}L^2)\right] + O(u^2). \tag{4.17}$$

This equation is similar to (4.9) and therefore, $\xi_L^{(2e)}$ has an anomalous scaling behaviour. However, as already noticed in the σ-model, instead of δr, the scaling function contains $\delta\tilde{r}$, indicating the presence of a finite-volume temperature renormalization proportional to L^{-2}.

A Some useful functions

We define:

$$\Psi(\lambda_L, L) \equiv \frac{1}{L^d}\sum_{q\in\Lambda_L^*-\{0\}} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2+\lambda_L} - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{\hat{q}^2+\lambda_L}, \tag{A.1}$$

for $\lambda_L \geq 0$. We wish now to compute the asymptotic behaviour of $\Psi(\lambda_L, L)$ for $\lambda_L \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, $\lambda_L L^2$ fixed. We begin by rewriting $\Psi(\lambda_L, L)$ as

$$\Psi(\lambda_L, L) = \; -\frac{1}{L^d\lambda_L} \; + \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d-\{0\}} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{\hat{q}^2+\lambda_L} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}L}, \tag{A.2}$$

where we have used the Poisson resummation formula

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}L} = \left(\frac{2\pi}{L}\right)^d \sum_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \delta^{(d)}\left(\mathbf{q} - \frac{2\pi}{L}\mathbf{m}\right). \tag{A.3}$$

The integral in Eq. (A.2) is ultraviolet convergent because of the phase factor, and, in the limit we are interested in, the relevant region of integration corresponds to q small. Thus, we can expand in powers of q the denominator and extend the integration domain to the whole space. We obtain

$$\Psi(\lambda_L, L) \approx L^{2-d}\mathcal{I}\left(\lambda_L L^2\right), \tag{A.4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho) \equiv -\frac{1}{\rho} + \sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d-\{0\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d}\frac{1}{q^2+\rho} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}}. \tag{A.5}$$

The corrections are of order L^{-d} times a function of $\lambda_L L^2$. We wish now to compute the behaviour of $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ for $\rho \to 0$. For this purpose, we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(\rho) &= -\frac{1}{\rho} + \int_0^\infty dt\, e^{-t\rho}\left[\sum_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^d-\{0\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d^dq}{(2\pi)^d} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{n}-tq^2}\right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\rho} + \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2}}\, e^{-\rho t}\left[\mathcal{B}^d\left(\frac{1}{4\,\pi\,t}\right) - 1\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}(s) \equiv \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-\pi s n^2}. \tag{A.7}$$

After the change of variable $t \mapsto t/4\pi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(\rho) &= -\frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{1}{4\pi}\left(\int_0^1 + \int_1^\infty\right) dt\, e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t}\frac{1}{t^{d/2}}\left[\mathcal{B}^d\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) - 1\right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_1^\infty dt\, e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\frac{1}{t}} t^{d/2-2}\left[\mathcal{B}^d(t) - 1\right] + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_1^\infty dt\, e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t}\frac{1}{t^{d/2}}\left[\mathcal{B}^d\left(\frac{1}{t}\right) - 1\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{A.8}$$

where in the first integral we performed the change of variable $t \mapsto 1/t$. By using the identity which follows from the Poisson resummation formula

$$\mathcal{B}(s) = \left(\frac{1}{s}\right)^{1/2} \mathcal{B}\left(\frac{1}{s}\right), \tag{A.9}$$

we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(\rho) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}} - 1}{\rho} - \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_1^\infty dt\, t^{-d/2} e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t} + \\
&+ \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_1^\infty dt\, \left(e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t} + t^{d/2-2}e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\frac{1}{t}}\right)\left[\mathcal{B}^d(t) - 1\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{A.10}$$

Note that the first and the third term in $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ may be expanded in integer powers of ρ around $\rho = 0$, while the second term has an expansion of the form (for $d > 0$ and $d/2$ not integer):

$$\int_1^\infty dt\, t^{-d/2} e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(\frac{d}{2}-1-k)\; k!} \left(\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\right)^k \; + \; \left(\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \Gamma\left(\frac{2-d}{2}\right) \; . \tag{A.11}$$

The generalization for $d/2$ integer is straightforward:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^\infty dt\, t^{-d/2} e^{-\frac{\rho}{4\pi}t} \;\; &= \sum_{k=0,\; k\neq \frac{d}{2}-1}^{+\infty} \frac{(-1)^k}{(\frac{d}{2}-1-k)\; k!} \left(\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\right)^k \\ &\quad + \frac{(-1)^{\frac{d}{2}}}{(\frac{d}{2}-1)!} \left(\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\right)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \left[\gamma + \ln\left(\frac{\rho}{4\pi}\right)\right] \; . \end{aligned} \tag{A.12}$$

As a consequence of these results, we find that $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ is finite for $\rho \to 0$, together with its derivatives $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0)$, $k < \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1$.

We wish now to define a second function

$$\widehat{\Psi}(\lambda_L, L) \equiv \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L} - \sum_{n=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1} (-\lambda_L)^n \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^{n+1}}, \tag{A.13}$$

which is defined for $\lambda_L > -\hat{q}^2_{\min}$ where $q_{\min} = (2\pi/L, 0, \ldots, 0)$, and for $d/2$ not integer. Here $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the integer part of x.

We are interested, as before, in the asymptotic limit $\lambda_L \to 0$, $L \to \infty$, $\lambda_L L^2$ finite. For this purpose we rewrite:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Psi}(\lambda_L, L) \;\; &= \;\; \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\hat{q}^2 + \lambda_L} - \sum_{n=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1} \frac{(-\lambda_L)^n}{(\hat{q}^2)^{n+1}} \right\} + \\ &= \;\; \sum_{n=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 1} (-\lambda_L)^n \left\{ \frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^{n+1}} - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\frac{dq}{2\pi}\right)^d \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^{n+1}} \right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

Now, in the first sum we can replace $\hat{q}^2$ by q^2 and extend the summation over $\mathbb{Z}^d$, since, because of the subtracted term, the resulting series converges. For the second term we immediately see that, for $1 \leq n < d/2$,

$$\frac{1}{L^d} \sum_{q \in \Lambda_L^* - \{0\}} \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^n} - \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{d^d q}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(\hat{q}^2)^n} = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \frac{\partial^{n-1}}{\partial \sigma^{n-1}} \Psi(\sigma, L) \bigg|_{\sigma=0} . \tag{A.15}$$

Using the asymptotic expansion of $\Psi(\lambda_L, L)$ we finally obtain

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) = \lim_{L\to\infty} \frac{1}{L^{2-d}} \widehat{\Psi}\left(\frac{\rho}{L^2}, L\right), \tag{A.16}$$

where

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} \mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d - \{0\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \mathbf{n}^2 + \rho} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{(-\rho)^k}{(4\pi^2 \mathbf{n}^2)^{k+1}} \right\}. \tag{A.17}$$

This implies that for $k < \lfloor d/2 \rfloor - 1$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}^{(k)}(0) = \mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0). \tag{A.18}$$

For positive λ_L we wish to evaluate the difference between $\mathcal{I}(\rho)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)$. For this purpose we rewrite (A.6) using (A.9)

$$\mathcal{I}(\rho) = \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2}}\, e^{-\rho t} \left\{ (4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2} [\mathcal{B}^d(4\pi t) - 1] - 1 \right\}. \tag{A.19}$$

Then, for $d/2$ not integer, since $\mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0)$ exists for $k < \frac{d}{2} - 1$, we rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}(\rho) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} \mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0) \\
&\quad + \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2}} \left[e^{-\rho t} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{(-t\rho)^k}{k!} \right] \left\{ (4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2} [\mathcal{B}^d(4\pi t) - 1] - 1 \right\} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{\rho^k}{k!} \mathcal{I}^{(k)}(0) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d - \{0\}} \left\{ \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \mathbf{n}^2 + \rho} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{(-\rho)^k}{(4\pi^2 \mathbf{n}^2)^{k+1}} \right\} \\
&\quad - \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{(4\,\pi\,t)^{d/2}} \left[e^{-\rho t} - \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \rfloor -1} \frac{(-t\rho)^k}{k!} \right] \\
&= \widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho) - \frac{\rho^{d/2-1}}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} \Gamma\left(1 - \frac{d}{2}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

from which, by comparison with (A.10) and (A.11), we see that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\rho)$ can be extended analytically around $\rho = 0$.

References

[1] M. E. Fisher, in *Critical Phenomena, International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi", Course 51*, edited by M. S. Green, Academic Press, New York, 1971.

[2] M. E. Fisher and M. N. Barber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 1516 (1972).

[3] Y. Imry and B. Bergman, Phys. Rev. A **3**, 1416 (1971).

[4] E. Brézin, J. Physique **43**, 15 (1982).

[5] E. Brézin and J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B **257** [FS14], 867 (1985).

[6] J. L. Cardy, editor, *Finite-Size Scaling* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988).

[7] M. Lüscher, P. Weisz, and U. Wolff, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 221 (1991).

[8] M. Hasenbusch, J. Physique I **3**, 753 (1993).

[9] H. W. J. Blöte and G. Kamieniarz, Physica A **196**, 455 (1993).

[10] H. W. J. Blöte, E. Luijten, and J. R. Heringa, J. Phys. A **28**, 6289 (1995).

[11] S. Caracciolo, R. G. Edwards, S. J. Ferreira, A. Pelissetto and A. D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2969 (1995), hep-lat/9409004.

[12] S. Caracciolo, R. G. Edwards, A. Pelissetto and A. D. Sokal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1891 (1995), hep-lat/9411009.

[13] J. Salas and A. D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **88**, 567 (1997), hep-lat/9607030.

[14] S. J. Ferreira and A. D. Sokal, J. Stat. Phys. **96**, 461 (1999), cond-mat/9811345.

[15] M. Hasenbusch, K. Pinn, and S. Vinti, Phys. Rev. B **59**, 11471 (1999).

[16] H. G. Ballesteros, L. A. Fernández, V. Martín-Mayor, A. Muñoz Sudupe, G. Parisi, and J. J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, J. Phys. A **32**, 1 (1999).

[17] M. E. Fisher, in *Renormalization Group in Critical Phenomena and Quantum Field Theory*, ed. by J. Gunton and M. S. Green (Temple. Univ., Philadelphia, 1974).

[18] M. E. Fisher, in *Critical Phenomena*, Lecture Notes in Physics, vol. 186, edited by F. J. W. Hahne (Springer, Berlin, 1983).

[19] V. Privman and M. E. Fisher, J. Stat. Phys. **33**, 385 (1983).

[20] M. E. Fisher, Rev. Mod. Phys. **46**, 597 (1974).

[21] K. Binder, M. Nauenberg, V. Privman and P. Young, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 1498 (1985).

[22] K. Leung, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **3**, 367 (1992).

[23] J. Rudnick, H. Guo, and D. Jasnow, J. Stat. Phys. **41**, 353 (1985).

[24] E. Eisenriegler and R. Tomaschiz, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 4876 (1987).

[25] S. Caracciolo and A. Pelissetto, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 105007 (1998), hep-lat/9804001. Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **53**, 693 (1997)